

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/064,032	BJAERUM ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Christopher L. Lavin	2621

**All Participants:**

(1) Christopher L. Lavin.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Joesph Butscher (Reg. 48,326).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 2 December 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

5,622,174

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The examiner felt that the two sides were arguing due to a grammatical matter. To clear up the confusion the examiner called the applicant's representative. A further explanation can be found in the advisory action.*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**BRIAN WERNER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)